

### REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, and 11 remain pending in this application. Claims 6, 9, and 12 are cancelled herein.

Applicant submits herewith a substitute specification and abstract wherein amendments are effected to place the text thereof into proper English and in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) as requested by the Examiner. Also accompanying this amendment is a reproduction of the original specification and abstract with markings indicating the amendments effected in the substitute specification. No new matter is added. Entry of the substitute specification and abstract is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner rejected the claims as failing to conform with current U.S. practice.

This rejection is moot regarding claims 6, 9, and 12 since they have been cancelled. Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, and 11 have been amended and are now believed to conform with U.S. practice. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,601,959 (Brault et al.).


This rejection is moot regarding claims 6, 9, and 12 since they have been cancelled. Claim 1 is patentable over Brault et al. at least for the reason that Brault et al. does not disclose the characteristics of an adhesive spreading over the pattern due to its surface tension, or the capability of transferring patterns such that they can overlay one another, as recited in claim 1. Claim 2 is patentable over Brault et al. at least for the reason that Brault et al. does not disclose an adhesive that can be colored by paint, as recited in claim 2. Claims 7 and 10 are patentable over Brault et al. at least for the reason that Brault et al. does not disclose the capability of overlaying patterns on one another, as recited in claims 7 and 10. While the Examiner has stated that the 3M adhesive disclosed in Brault et al. is transparent, Brault et al. does not disclose such characteristic. Accordingly, claim 7 is further patentable over Brault et al. at least for the reason that Brault et al. does not disclose a transparent or semi-transparent adhesive, as recited in claim 7. Claim 10 is further patentable over Brault et al. at least for the reason that Brault et al. fails to disclose an adhesive as being flexible and as having staining properties, as recited in claim 10. Claims 2, 4, 5, 8, and 11 are patentable over Brault et al. at least for the reason that they depend on a patentable base claim. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Brault et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,110,317 (Sandor).

Claim 3 is patentable at least for the reason that it depends on a patentable base claim. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By   
C. Bruce Hamburg  
Reg. No. 22,389  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340

enc: Substitute specification and abstract and marked reproduction of original specification and abstract.